

# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California



## ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES OF A SENSOR ALLOCATION MODEL

by

Donald P. Gaver  
Patricia A. Jacobs  
Mark Youngren

May 1995

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

Prepared for: Institute for Joint Warfare Analysis, Monterey, CA 93943-5000  
and  
Force Structure, Resources and Assessment Directorate (J8),  
The Joint Staff, Washington, DC 20350-5000

19950602 018

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5000

Rear Admiral T. A. Mercer  
Superintendent

Harrison Shull  
Provost

This report was prepared for and funded by the Institute for Joint Warfare Analysis, Monterey, CA, and the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate (J8), The Joint Staff, Washington DC.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:



DONALD P. GAVEN, JR.  
Professor of Operations Research



PATRICIA A. JACOBS  
Professor of Operations Research




MARK YOUNGREN  
Assistant Professor of Operations Research

Reviewed by:



PETER PURDUE  
Professor and Chairman  
Department of Operations Research

Released by:



PAUL J. MARTO  
Dean of Research

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE May 1995		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Asymptotic Properties of a Sensor Allocation Model			5. FUNDING NUMBERS RLGPD	
6. AUTHOR(S) Donald P. Gaver, Patricia A. Jacobs and Mark Youngren				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NPS-OR-95-002	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Joint Warfare Analysis, Monterey, CA 93943-5000 Force Structure, Resources and Assessment Directorate (J8), The Joint Staff, Washington DC, 20350-5000			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  A dynamic adaptive protocol for allocating sensor assets to locations where most opponents' assets appear is described, analyzed, and illustrated.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS adaptive allocation; estimation of the number of binomial trials; normal approximations			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 36	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

# Asymptotic Properties of a Sensor Allocation Model

D. P. Gaver

P. A. Jacobs

M. Youngren

## 0. Introduction and Summary

Sensor resources are to be allocated among  $I$  non-overlapping but possibly contiguous geographical locations called *nodes*. Each sensor look at a node results in an observation, with error, of the number of *units* that are at the node. In military applications *units* may be individual assets such as tanks or ships, or possibly small groups organized as platoons or companies and in geographical proximity; in ecological applications, they might be animals, singly or in groups, or particular vegetation types. The observations are then to be used to estimate the numbers of units at each node. The problem is to allocate sensor resources so as to minimize a measure of the error of the estimates, and of the estimate of the sum of the numbers at all nodes. It is assumed that the units remain on the nodes and do not migrate, although for some sensor types the units must be in motion on the node at least some of the time in order for detection to take place.

The objective of this paper is to propose and study *adaptive allocation* of sensor effort in such a way as to focus the sensor's attention sequentially and purposefully on nodes so as to pay most attention to those nodes about which the greatest uncertainty, or interest, currently prevails. This problem has features in common with adaptive bin-packing problems (cf. Gaver et al., 1995) and adaptive allocation of customers to servers (cf. Gaver et al., 1993).

Numerical examples show that a properly selected sequentially adaptive rule will provide estimates of improved precision.

A related investigation that has recently come to our attention is that by Thompson and Seber (1994). Their procedures can also be analyzed using the methodology proposed in this paper.

## 1. The Model

There are  $I$  nodes. Assume that node  $i$  contains  $r_i$  units. Sensor resources are allocated to one of the  $I$  nodes at times that occur according to a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda$ . The sensor resource is allocated to node  $i$  with probability  $\alpha_i$  which is tailored to depend on past allocations in a purposeful way. Let  $Z_n(i)$  be the  $n^{\text{th}}$  observation of node  $i$ ; a simple model is that  $\{Z_n(i); n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  are iid with binomial distribution with  $r_i$  trials and known probability of success  $p_i$  which is the probability of unit detection at node  $i$ . We assume for illustration that the number of units on a node does not change, although an adaptive scheme of the type proposed should effectively follow changes in node population.

Let  $N_i(t)$  be the number of times in  $[0, t]$  that node  $i$  is observed by a sensor. Let

$$V(i; t) = Z_1(i) + \dots + Z_{N_i(t)}(i)$$

be the sum of all the observations during  $[0, t]$  for node  $i$ .

Under some conditions  $V(i; t)$  has a binomial distribution with  $N_i(t)r_i$  trials and probability of success  $p_i$ , given  $N_i(t)$ , although this assumption may not be especially accurate in general. Assuming it to be adequate for the moment, an estimate for the number of units at node  $i$  based on observations made during  $[0, t]$  is

$$\hat{r}_i(t) = \frac{V(i; t)}{N_i(t)p_i} \quad (1.1)$$

with

$$\text{Var}[\hat{r}_i(t)] = \frac{r_i N_i(t) p_i (1 - p_i)}{N_i(t)^2 p_i^2} \quad (1.2)$$

$$= \frac{r_i (1 - p_i)}{N_i(t) p_i} = \frac{\hat{r}_i(t) (1 - p_i)}{N_i(t) p_i} = \frac{V(i; t) (1 - p_i)}{N_i(t)^2 p_i^2}. \quad (1.3)$$

There has been much statistical attention paid to estimating the number of trials in a binomial distribution, given probability of success; for recent discussion see Hall (1994). Here we use the simplest such estimator.

Now consider the following *adaptive allocation rule*. A sensor resource arriving at time  $t$  is allocated to node  $i$  with probability

$$\alpha_i(N_i(t), V_i(t); N(t), V(t)) = \frac{h_i(N_i(t), V_i(t))}{\sum_{j=1}^I h_j(N_j(t), V_j(t))} \quad (1.4)$$

where the  $h_i$  are strictly positive sufficiently smooth functions such that  $h_j(c^p x, c^p y) = c^p h_j(x, y)$ .

One possible form for  $h_i$  is

$$h_i(x, v) = \left[ \frac{a_i}{x} + \frac{v(1 - p_i)}{x^2 p_i^2} \right]^\gamma \quad \text{for } \gamma > 0 \text{ and } a_i > 0; \quad (1.5)$$

if it is assumed that given  $N_i(t)$ ,  $V_i(t)$  is binomially distributed with mean  $N_i(t)p_i$ , then from (1.3) it follows that for this function  $h_i$ , sensor resources tend to be allocated to those nodes for which the variance, and hence its square root, the standard error of the estimated number of units, is the largest; the probability of allocation to the most uncertain node (by this measure) increases rapidly, approaching unity as  $\gamma$  increases. This tends to bring down that standard error quickly, and to equate standard errors of the estimates across nodes. Clearly, alternative measures of overall sensor performance are feasible, and possibly desirable, such as ones that endeavor to equalize fractional or percent error on

nodes, or ones that also respond to an independent measure of importance of the units on a node. Additionally, node contents may be of various types, which can be considered. Thus, the present discussion is of an illustration of an adaptive allocation scheme.

The purposeful allocation of (1.4) introduces dependence between  $\{N_i(t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{V_i(t); t \geq 0\}$ . Asymptotic results for the means  $E[N_i(t)]$  and  $E[V_i(t)]$  as the rate of the Poisson process  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  are obtained in Section 2. It is shown that the purposeful allocation estimate  $\hat{r}_i(t)$  is asymptotically unbiased. Section 3 presents results for the asymptotic means for specific form of function  $h_i$  (1.5). Section 4 discusses asymptotic results for the second moments of  $\{N_i(t); t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{V_i(t); t \geq 0\}$  and presents approximate expressions for the  $Var[\hat{r}_i(t)]$  and  $Var\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$ . Section 5 describes a simpler Poisson approximation. Section 6 presents results from simulation experiments.

## 2. First-Moment Calculations and Asymptotics

Note that for  $h > 0$

$$E[N_i(t+h)|N(t), V(t)] = N_i(t) + \lambda \alpha_i(N, V)h. \quad (2.1)$$

Thus

$$E[N_i(t+h)] = E[N_i(t)] + \lambda E[\alpha_i(N, V)h]. \quad (2.2)$$

Assuming derivatives exist, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}E[N_i(t)] = \lambda E[\alpha_i(N(t), V(t))]. \quad (2.3)$$

Similarly,

$$E[V_i(t+h)|N(t), V(t)] = V_i(t) + \lambda h \alpha_i(N, V)r_i p_i. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus,

$$E[V_i(t+h)] = E[V_i(t)] + \lambda h r_i p_i E[\alpha_i(N, V)h]. \quad (2.5)$$

Assuming derivatives exist, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} E[V_i(t)] = r_i p_i \lambda E[\alpha_i(N, V)]. \quad (2.6)$$

Assume  $\alpha_i$  is of the form (1.4) where  $h_i$  is sufficiently smooth with  $h_i(c^p x, c^p y) = c^p h_i(x, y)$  for constants  $c$  and  $h_i(x, y) > 0$  for all  $x, y > 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i(N(t), V(t)) &= \frac{h_i(N_i(t), V_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(N_j(t), V_j(t))} \\ &= \frac{h_i(N_i(t)/\lambda, V_i(t)/\lambda)}{\sum_j h_j(N_j(t)/\lambda, V_j(t)/\lambda)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Assume  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} N_i(t)/\lambda = m_i(t)$ ,  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} V_i(t)/\lambda = v_i(t)$ ,  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dt} E[N_i(t)/\lambda] = \frac{d}{dt} m_i(t)$ , and  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dt} E[V_i(t)/\lambda] = \frac{d}{dt} v_i(t)$ .

Dividing both sides of (2.3) and (2.6) by  $\lambda$  and letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , the bounded convergence theorem yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} m_i(t) = \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))}. \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_i(t) = r_i p_i \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad (2.9)$$

Thus,

$$v_i(t) = r_i p_i m_i(t). \quad (2.10)$$



### 3. Purposeful Allocation

The equations for  $m_i(t)$ , (2.8), can be solved for special functions  $h_i$ . For example, assume

$$h_i(x, y) = \left[ \frac{a_i}{x} + \frac{y(1-p_i)}{x^2 p_i^2} \right]^\gamma \quad \text{for } \gamma \geq 0 \text{ and } a_i > 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(t) &= m_i(t) r_i p_i, \\ h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t)) &= \left[ \frac{a_i}{m_i(t)} + \frac{r_i(1-p_i)}{m_i(t) p_i} \right]^\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

In this case (2.8) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\frac{d}{dt} m_i(t)}{\frac{d}{dt} m_j(t)} = \left[ \frac{a_i + r_i c_i m_j(t)}{a_j + r_j c_j m_i(t)} \right]^\gamma \quad (3.3)$$

where  $c_i = (1 - p_i)/p_i$ .

The functions

$$m_i(t) = K(a_i + r_i c_i)^{\gamma/(\gamma+1)} t \quad (3.4)$$

with

$$K = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^I (a_i + r_i c_i)^{\gamma/(\gamma+1)} \right]^{-1} \quad (3.5)$$

are a solution to (2.8).

Thus, in the limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the probability that a sensor resource at time  $t$  looks at node  $i$  is

$$\alpha_i = \frac{(a_i + r_i c_i)^{\gamma/(\gamma+1)}}{\sum_j (a_j + r_j c_j)^{\gamma/(\gamma+1)}}. \quad (3.6)$$

If  $\gamma = 0$ , then

$$\alpha_i = 1/I \quad (3.7)$$

and the allocation is equally likely.

If  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\alpha_i = \frac{a_i + r_i c_i}{\sum_j a_j + r_j c_j}. \quad (3.8)$$

If, further, the probability of detection on node  $i$ ,  $p_i$ , is constant for all the nodes, then the probabilistic allocation for  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  is roughly proportional to the number of units on the node.

#### 4. Scaling and Approximate Variances of Estimators

Let

$$X_j(t) = \frac{N_j(t) - \lambda m_j(t)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \quad (4.1)$$

$$Y_j(t) = \frac{V_j(t) - \lambda v_j(t)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \quad (4.2)$$

In Appendix A, moment generating functions are used to show the asymptotic normality of  $\{(X_j(t), Y_j(t)); t \geq 0\}$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . Further, differential equations for their second moments are obtained.

Rewriting

$$N_j(t) = \lambda m_j(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} X_j(t) \quad (4.3)$$

$$V_j(t) = \lambda v_j(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} Y_j(t) \quad (4.4)$$

An approximate variance of the estimator of the number of units on node  $i$ ,

$$\hat{r}_i(t) = \frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)} \frac{1}{p_i} \quad (4.5)$$

can be computed using the "delta method" as follows; cf. Bickel and Doksum (1977). To begin,

$$\text{Var}[\hat{r}_i(t)] = \frac{1}{p_i^2} \text{Var}\left[\frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)}\right]. \quad (4.6)$$

A Taylor expansion yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)} &= \frac{v_i(t) + Y_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}}{m_i(t) + X_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}} \\ &= \frac{v_i(t)}{m_i(t)} + \frac{1}{m_i(t)} [Y_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}] - \frac{v_i(t)}{m_i(t)^2} (X_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}) \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Thus,

$$\text{Var}\left[\frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)}\right] \approx E\left[\left(\frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)} - \frac{v_i(t)}{m_i(t)}\right)^2\right] \quad (4.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\lambda m_i(t)^2} \left\{ E[Y_i^2(t)] + \left[\frac{v_i(t)}{m_i(t)}\right]^2 E[X_i^2(t)] - 2\frac{v_i(t)}{m_i(t)} E[Y_i(t)X_i(t)] \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda m_i(t)^2} \left\{ E[Y_i^2(t)] + (r_i p_i)^2 E[X_i^2(t)] - 2r_i p_i E[X_i(t)Y_i(t)] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Hence, an approximate variance of the estimate of the number of units on node  $i$

$$\text{Var}[\hat{r}_i(t)] \approx \frac{1}{p_i^2} \frac{1}{\lambda m_i(t)^2} \left\{ E[Y_i^2(t)] + (r_i p_i)^2 E[X_i^2(t)] - 2r_i p_i E[X_i(t)Y_i(t)] \right\}. \quad (4.10)$$

To approximate the variance of the sum of the estimates, a Taylor expansion yields

$$\begin{aligned}
E\left[\frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)} \frac{V_j(t)}{N_j(t)}\right] &= E\left[\frac{v_i(t) + Y_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}}{m_i(t) + X_i(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}} \frac{v_j(t) + Y_j(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}}{m_j(t) + X_j(t)/\sqrt{\lambda}}\right] \\
&= \frac{v_i(t)v_j(t)}{m_i(t)m_j(t)} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{m_i(t)m_j(t)} E[Y_i(t)Y_j(t)] \\
&\quad - \frac{v_i(t)v_i(t)}{\lambda[m_i(t)m_i(t)]^2} E[X_i(t)X_j(t)] + o\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

for  $i \neq j$ .

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov(\hat{r}_i(t), \hat{r}_j(t)) &= \frac{1}{p_i p_j} Cov\left(\frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)}, \frac{V_j(t)}{N_j(t)}\right) \\
&\approx \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{p_i m_i(t)} \frac{1}{p_j m_j(t)} \left\{ E[Y_i(t)Y_j(t)] - r_i p_i r_j p_j E[X_i(t)X_j(t)] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Expressions (4.10) and (4.12) can be used to approximate  $Var\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$ .

## 5. A Simpler Poisson Approximation

Assume the probability of allocation  $\alpha_i$  is independent of  $(V_i(t), N_i(t))$ ; then the number of looks at node  $i$  is a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda\alpha_i$  independent of the other nodes. Further

$$E[N_i(t)] = 1 + \alpha_i t \tag{5.1}$$

$$E[V_i(t)] = r_i p_i [1 + \alpha_i t] \tag{5.2}$$

$$Var[N_i(t)] = \alpha_i t \tag{5.3}$$

$$Var[V_i(t)] = r_i p_i (1 - p_i) + \alpha_i t [r_i p_i (1 - p_i) + (r_i p_i)^2] \tag{5.4}$$

$$\text{Cov}[N_i(t), V_i(t)] = r_i p_i \alpha_i t \quad (5.5)$$

where we assume that at time 0 each node is looked at once.

In this case (4.10) becomes

$$\text{Var}[\hat{r}_i(t)] = \frac{1}{p_i^2} \frac{r_i p_i (1 - p_i)}{1 + \alpha_i t}. \quad (5.6)$$

and the estimators  $\hat{r}_i(t)$  are independent.

Assume purposeful allocation is adapted with function  $h_i$  as in (3.1). A simple approximation to  $\text{Var}\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$  can be obtained by neglecting all covariances and assuming the number of looks at node  $i$ ,  $\{N_i(t); t \geq 0\}$ , is a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda \alpha_i$  where  $\alpha_i$  is determined by (3.6). In this case

$$\text{Var}\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right] \approx \sum_i \frac{1}{p_i} \frac{r_i (1 - p_i)}{(1 + \alpha_i t)}. \quad (5.7)$$

## 6. Numerical Examples

Suppose there are 3 nodes with  $r_j$  units on node  $j$  with  $r_1 = 49$ ,  $r_2 = 25$ , and  $r_3 = 16$ . The probabilities of detecting a unit on node  $j$ ,  $p_j$ , are  $p_1 = 1/11$ ,  $p_2 = 0.5$ , and  $p_3 = 10/11$ .

The variance of the estimate of the sum of the units on all the nodes under purposeful allocation with  $h_i$  as in (3.1) was studied using simulation for  $\gamma = 0, 1, 10$ . Each replication of the simulation begins with one observation at each node. The times of arrival of a Poisson process with rate 1 are then simulated. A node for observation at time  $t$  is randomly chosen using probabilities

$$\alpha_i(t) = K(t) \left[ \frac{a_i}{N_i(t)} + \frac{V_i(t)(1 - p_i)}{N_i(t)^2 p_i^2} \right]$$

for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  with  $K(t)$  the normalizing constant. A binomial observation is generated for the node chosen. The simulation has 500 replications.

Table 1 records the sample mean and square root of the sample variance of the sum of the estimates  $\sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{r}_i(t)$  for  $t = 5, 10, 20, 50$  where

$$\hat{r}_i(t) = \frac{V_i(t)}{N_i(t)p_i}.$$

Also shown are the sample means of the square root of the sum of estimated approximate variances (1.3)

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^2(t) = \frac{V_i(t)(1-p_i)}{N_i(t)^2 p_i^2}.$$

**Table 1**  
**Estimate of Total Number of Units on All Nodes**

$r_1 = 49, r_2 = 25, r_3 = 16; p_1 = 1/11, p_2 = 0.5, p_3 = 10/11$

		Simulation			Approximation	
		$\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)$		$\sqrt{\sum_i \sigma_i^2(t)}$	Square Root of Differential Equation Approx Variance	Square Root of Poisson Approx Variance
Time	$\gamma$	Sample Mean	Square Root of Sample Variance	Sample Mean		
5	0	89.8	18.0	15.0	13.9	13.9
	1	88.1	15.1	10.7	12.3	10.7
	10	89.3	15.2	10.9	12.5	10.4
10	0	90.3	12.4	11.9	10.9	10.9
	1	89.8	9.2	8.2	9.1	8.1
	10	90.1	10.2	8.6	10.2	8.0
20	0	90.0	8.9	8.6	8.2	8.2
	1	89.5	7.1	6.1	6.7	6.0
	10	89.5	8.3	6.5	8.0	6.1
50	0	89.9	5.8	5.5	5.4	5.4
	1	89.9	3.9	3.9	4.2	3.9
	10	89.5	6.2	4.3	5.7	4.2

Table 1 also displays results of the approximate variance  $Var\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$  obtained using (4.10) and (4.12) and solving the differential equations (2.8) and the second moment equations in Appendix A, (A.27) – (A.32). The equations were solved numerically using the 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> order Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg method as implemented in MATLAB; (cf. Math Works, 1992).

Table 1 also displays the simple Poisson approximation to  $Var\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$  of (5.7) with the  $\alpha_i$  in (3.6).

Recall that the estimate  $Var\left[\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)\right]$  is unbiased for both approximations. The true value of  $\sum r_i$  is 90. The differential equation approximation is close to the square root of the sample variance for all values of  $\gamma$  for times 10, 20, and 50. The Poisson approximation is close to the square root of the sum of the estimated approximate variances; both of these approximations are neglecting the covariances induced by the purposeful allocation; these covariances become more pronounced as  $\gamma$  becomes larger. There is no covariance for  $\gamma=0$ , equally likely allocation. Note that the Poisson approximation is conservative. However for  $\gamma=1$ , the Poisson approximation is within about 10% of the differential equation approximation which incorporates the covariances. However the difference is larger for  $\gamma=10$ .

Note that the square root of the sample variance and the differential equation approximation suggest that purposeful allocation with  $\gamma=1$  yields the smallest variance of the estimated sum of the numbers of units on all the nodes. A rationale for this suggestion follows.

Suppose there are a fixed number of looks  $K$  that the sensor can take of all nodes and the number of units on each node  $i$ ,  $r_i$ , is known along with the

probability of detecting a unit on node  $i$ ,  $p_i$ . Let  $k_i$  be the number of looks the sensor gives to node  $i$ . If each observation has a binomial distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{r}_i(t) \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{k_i r_i p_i (1-p_i)}{k_i^2 p_i^2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{r_i (1-p_i)}{k_i p_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Lagrange multipliers can be used to show that the (approximate)  $k_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  that minimize  $\text{Var} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{r}_i(t) \right]$  are  $k_i = [r_i(1-p_i)/p_i]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . This solution corresponds to the  $\alpha_i$  of (3.6) with  $a_i = 0$  and  $\gamma = 1$ . Thus, if one is interested in minimizing the estimated variance of the sum of the number of units on all the nodes, then one should look at node  $i$  a number of times proportional to  $[r_i(1-p_i)/p_i]^{0.5}$ . If one were interested in minimizing the estimated variance of the estimate of the number of units on the node with the greatest number of units then one would allocate all looks to that node; this corresponds to the purposeful allocation policy of  $\gamma = \infty$ .

Tables 2 and 3 present results of the simulation experiment with  $r_1 = 49$ ,  $r_2 = 25$ ,  $r_3 = 16$  and  $p_1 = 0.7$ ,  $p_2 = 0.8$ , and  $p_3 = 0.9$ . Table 2 presents the simulation and approximation results for the estimate of the sum of units on all the nodes. Table 3 presents the simulation and approximation results for the number of units on the individual nodes. The differential equation results are close to the simulated values for times  $t = 10, 20, 50$ . The Poisson approximation also seems to be adequate. The Poisson approximation may be doing better in this case because the probabilities of unit detection are larger. One source of the covariance between the estimators  $\hat{r}_i(t)$  is the possibility that  $V(i, t)$  may be 0, in



which case node  $i$  will not be visited very frequently for  $\gamma > 0$  for the purposeful allocation with function  $h_i$  as in (3.1).

**Table 2**  
**Estimate of Total Number of Units on All Nodes**  
 $r_1 = 49, r_2 = 25, r_3 = 16; p_1 = 0.7, p_2 = 0.8, p_3 = 0.9$

		Simulation			Approximation	
		$\sum_i \hat{r}_i(t)$		$\sqrt{\sum_i \sigma_i^2(t)}$	Square Root of Differential Equation Approx Variance	Square Root of Poisson Approx Variance
Time	$\gamma$	Sample Mean	Square Root of Sample Variance	Sample Mean		
5	0	89.9	5.52	3.70	3.30	3.30
	1	89.4	6.53	3.15	3.11	3.02
	10	88.9	8.55	3.14	3.06	2.98
10	0	90.1	2.75	2.84	2.59	2.59
	1	89.9	2.37	2.45	2.46	2.35
	10	89.7	2.46	2.53	2.51	2.35
20	0	90.1	2.04	2.07	1.95	1.95
	1	90.0	1.72	1.80	1.90	1.76
	10	89.9	1.87	1.88	2.06	1.80
50	0	90.0	1.30	1.32	1.28	1.28
	1	90.0	1.12	1.17	1.29	1.16
	10	89.9	1.26	1.24	1.35	1.21

**Table 3**  
Simulation: 500 replications  
Estimate of Number of Units on Node

	$\gamma$	Node 1			Node 2			Node 3		
		Mean	$\hat{\tau}_i(t)$ Square Root Sample Variance (Diff Eqtn Approx)	$\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_i^2(t)}$ Sample Mean (Poisson Approx)	Mean	$\hat{\tau}_i(t)$ Square Root Sample Variance (Diff Eqtn Approx)	$\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_i^2(t)}$ Sample Mean (Poisson Approx)	Mean	$\hat{\tau}_i(t)$ Square Root Sample Variance (Diff Eqtn Approx)	$\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_i^2(t)}$ Sample Mean (Poisson Approx)
5	0	49.0	3.89 (2.81)	3.11 (2.81)	24.9	2.20 (1.53)	1.68 (1.53)	16.0	1.17 (0.82)	0.87 (0.82)
	1	48.6	3.95 (2.27)	2.37 (2.38)	24.8	2.38 (1.62)	1.69 (1.59)	16.0	1.54 (1.07)	1.13 (0.99)
	10	48.5	4.85 (2.00)	2.12 (2.17)	24.6	2.94 (1.88)	1.89 (1.70)	15.8	1.97 (1.33)	1.32 (1.13)
10	0	49.1	2.33 (2.20)	2.39 (2.20)	25.0	1.36 (1.20)	1.30 (1.20)	16.0	0.71 (0.64)	0.68 (0.64)
	1	49.0	1.81 (1.74)	1.81 (1.81)	24.9	1.36 (1.27)	1.32 (1.25)	16.0	0.96 (0.89)	0.93 (0.82)
	10	48.9	1.57 (1.53)	1.61 (1.63)	24.9	1.50 (1.44)	1.48 (1.37)	15.9	1.33 (1.29)	1.26 (1.00)
20	0	49.1	1.68 (1.66)	1.75 (1.66)	25.0	0.98 (0.90)	0.95 (0.90)	16.0	0.52 (0.48)	0.50 (0.48)
	1	49.0	1.32 (1.30)	1.32 (1.33)	24.9	0.97 (0.96)	0.98 (0.95)	16.0	0.71 (0.68)	0.71 (0.65)
	10	49.0	1.16 (1.15)	1.19 (1.19)	24.9	1.08 (1.08)	1.10 (1.05)	15.9	1.06 (1.00)	0.95 (0.84)
50	0	49.1	1.08 (1.09)	1.12 (1.09)	25.0	0.63 (0.59)	0.61 (0.59)	16.0	0.33 (0.32)	0.32 (0.32)
	1	49.0	0.88 (0.85)	0.86 (0.86)	25.0	0.64 (0.63)	0.64 (0.63)	16.0	0.45 (0.45)	0.46 (0.44)
	10	49.0	0.77 (0.76)	0.77 (0.77)	24.9	0.72 (0.72)	0.72 (0.70)	16.0	0.71 (0.66)	0.65 (0.61)

## REFERENCES

- P. J. Bickel and K. A. Doksum, "*Mathematical Statistics: Basic Ideas and Selected Topics*," Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco, CA, 1977.
- D. P. Gaver and P. A. Jacobs, "Asymptotic properties of stochastic greedy bin-packing," *Stochastic Models*, **11** (1995) pp. 333-348.
- D. P. Gaver, J. A. Morrison, and R. Silveira, "Service-adaptive multitype repairman problems," *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **53** (1993) pp. 454-470.
- P. Hall, "On the erratic behavior of estimators of  $N$  in the binomial  $N, p$  distribution," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **89** (1994) pp. 344-352.
- The Math Works, Inc., *MATLAB Reference Guide*, The Math Works, Inc., Natick, MA, August 1992.
- S. K. Thompson, and G. A. F. Seber, "Detectability in conventional and adaptive sampling," *Biometrics*, **50** (1994) pp. 712-725.

## APPENDIX A

In the Appendix we present details of the normal approximation. We follow an analytical approach used in a different context in Gaver and Jacobs (1995), and in Gaver, Morrison, and Silveira (1993). Let the moment-generating function (assumed to exist, otherwise use the characteristic function) be

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\theta, \xi; t) &= E[\exp\{\theta N(t) + \xi V(t)\}] \\ &= E\left[\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^I \theta_j N_j(t) + \sum_{j=1}^I \xi_j V_j(t)\right\}\right].\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

Condition on  $(N_i(t), V_i(t))$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}& E\left[\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^I \theta_j N_j(t+h) + \sum_{j=1}^I \xi_j V_j(t+h)\right\} \middle| N(t), V(t)\right] \\ &= (1 - \lambda h) \exp\{\theta N(t) + \xi V(t)\} \\ &\quad + \lambda h \sum_i \alpha_i(N(t), V(t)) \exp\{\theta N(t) + \xi V(t)\} [e^{\theta_i \hat{b}(\xi_i)}]\end{aligned}\tag{A.2}$$

where

$$\hat{b}(\xi_i) = E[e^{\xi_i Z(i)}].\tag{A.3}$$

with  $Z(i)$  an observation of the number of units on node  $i$ .

Let  $h \rightarrow 0$  to obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(\theta, \xi; t) = -\lambda \psi(\theta, \xi; t) + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^I E[\alpha_i(N(t), V(t)) \exp\{\theta N(t) + \xi V(t)\} e^{\theta_i \hat{b}(\xi_i)}].\tag{A.4}$$

### Scaling

Let

$$X_j(t) = \frac{N_j(t) - \lambda m_j(t)}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\tag{A.5}$$

$$Y_j(t) = \frac{V_j(t) - \lambda v_j(t)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and let  $\lambda \gg 1$ .

Let

$$\varphi(\theta, \xi; t) = E[\exp\{\theta X(t) + \xi Y(t)\}]; \quad (\text{A.7})$$

then

$$\psi(\theta/\sqrt{\lambda}, \xi/\sqrt{\lambda}; t) = \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \exp\{\sqrt{\lambda}[\theta m(t) + \xi v(t)]\}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Thus, we have the following equation from (A.8) and (A.4)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(\theta/\sqrt{\lambda}, \xi/\sqrt{\lambda}; t) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \exp\{\sqrt{\lambda}[\theta m(t) + \xi v(t)]\} \\ &+ \sqrt{\lambda} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \exp\{\sqrt{\lambda}[\theta m(t) + \xi v(t)]\} [\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t)] \\ &= \left[ -\lambda \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \right. \\ &+ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^I E \left[ \alpha_i \left( m(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} X(t), v(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} Y(t) \right) \exp\{\theta X(t) + \xi Y(t)\} e^{\theta_i/\sqrt{\lambda} \hat{b}_i(\xi_i/\sqrt{\lambda})} \right] \\ &\times \exp\{\sqrt{\lambda}[\theta m(t) + \xi v(t)]\} \Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Dividing both sides by  $\exp\{\sqrt{\lambda}[\theta m(t) + \xi v(t)]\}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) + \sqrt{\lambda} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) [\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t)] \\ &= -\lambda \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \\ &+ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^I E \left[ \left\{ \alpha_i(m(t), v(t)) + \sum_j \frac{\partial}{\partial m_j} \alpha_i(m(t), v(t)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} X_j(t) \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. + \sum_j \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_j} \alpha_i(m(t), v(t)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} Y_j(t) + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right) \right\} \exp\{\theta X(t) + \xi Y(t)\} \right] e^{\theta_i/\sqrt{\lambda} \hat{b}_i(\xi_i/\sqrt{\lambda})} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Let

$$\alpha_i(m(t), v(t)) = \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $h_j(x, y)$  is a sufficiently smooth function with first order partial derivatives and  $h_j(\lambda^p x, \lambda^p y) = \lambda^p h_j(x, y)$ .

Let

$$H_i(x; t) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial m_i} h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$H_i(y; t) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial v_i} h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$H_{ik}(x; t) = \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\left( \sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t)) \right)^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial m_k} h_k(m_k(t), v_k(t)) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$H_{ik}(y; t) = \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\left( \sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t)) \right)^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_k} h_k(m_k(t), v_k(t)) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_i(\lambda m_i(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} X_i(t), \lambda v_i(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} Y_i(t)) \\ &= \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_{j=1}^I h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[ H_i(x; t) X_i(t) + H_i(y; t) Y_i(t) + \sum_k H_{ik}(x; t) X_k(t) + \sum_k H_{ik}(y; t) Y_k(t) \right] + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right).$$

Since

$$\sum_i \alpha_i (\lambda m_i(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} X_i(t), \lambda v_i(t) + \sqrt{\lambda} Y_i(t)) = 1 \quad (\text{A.17})$$

this implies that the summed coefficients of  $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$ ,  $1/\lambda$  etc. must individually be 0.

Expression (A.10) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) + \sqrt{\lambda} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) [\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t)] \\ & = -\lambda \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \\ & + \lambda \sum_i \left[ 1 + \frac{\theta_i}{\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{b_1(i) \xi_i}{\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta_i^2}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_2(i) \xi_i^2}{\lambda} \right] \\ & \times \left\{ \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[ H_i(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) + H_i(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \sum_{k=1}^I \left[ H_{ik}(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) + H_{ik}(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_k} \varphi(\theta, \xi; t) \right] \right] \right\} + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where  $b_n(i) = E[Z(i)^n]$  the  $n^{\text{th}}$  moment of an observation at node  $i$ .

Let

$$\varphi(\theta, \xi; t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \varphi_{\ell}(\theta, \xi; t) \lambda^{-\ell/2}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Substituting (A.19) into (A.18) results in the following equation for  $\varphi_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + \sqrt{\lambda} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) [\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t)] \\
& = -\lambda \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \\
& + \lambda \sum_i \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} (\theta_i + b_1(i) \xi_i) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\lambda} (\theta_i^2 + b_2(i) \xi_i^2) \right] \\
& \times \left\{ \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[ H_i(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_i(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \sum_{k=1}^I \left[ H_{ik}(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_{ik}(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right] \right] \right\} + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right). \tag{A.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Equating terms of order  $\lambda^{l/2}$ , the terms of order  $\lambda$  cancel. The terms of order  $\sqrt{\lambda}$  result in the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) [\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t)] \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^I \left\{ \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) [\theta_i + b_1(i) \xi_i] \right. \\
& + H_i(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_i(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \\
& \left. + \sum_{k=1}^I \left[ H_{ik}(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_{ik}(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right] \right\} + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right). \tag{A.21}
\end{aligned}$$



The terms of order  $\sqrt{\lambda}$  cancel if

$$\theta m'(t) + \xi v'(t) = \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} [\theta_i + b_1(i) \xi_i]. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

In order for this to occur

$$\frac{d}{dt} m_i(t) = \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad i = 1, \dots, I \quad (\text{A.23})$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_i(t) = b_1(i) \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \quad i = 1, \dots, I. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Thus,

$$v_i(t) = b_1(i) m_i(t). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Next look for terms of order 1 in (A.20).

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \\ &= \sum_i \frac{h_i(m_i(t), v_i(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} b_2(i) \xi_i^2 + b_1(i) \theta_i \xi_i \right] \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \\ &+ \sum_i \left[ H_i(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_i(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right] [\theta_i + b_1(i) \xi_i] \\ &+ \sum_i \sum_k \left[ H_{ik}(x; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) + H_{ik}(y; t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_k} \varphi_0(\theta, \xi; t) \right] [\theta_i + b_1(i) \xi_i]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Equations for the joint moments of  $\{(X_j(t), Y_j(t))\}$  can be obtained by differentiating (A.26) with respect to  $\{\theta_i\}$  and  $\{\xi_i\}$  and evaluated at  $\theta = \xi = 0$ . The resulting equations are

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[X_\ell^2(t)] \\
&= \frac{h(m_\ell(t), v_\ell(t))}{\sum_j h(m_j(t), v_j(t))} + 2H_\ell(x; t) E[X_\ell(t)^2] + 2H_\ell(y; t) E[X_\ell(t)Y_\ell(t)] \\
&+ 2 \sum_k H_{\ell k}(x; t) E[X_\ell(t)X_k(t)] + 2 \sum_k H_{\ell k}(y; t) E[X_\ell(t)Y_k(t)]
\end{aligned} \tag{A.27}$$

For  $\ell \neq a$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[X_\ell(t)X_a(t)] \\
&= H_a(x; t) E[X_a(t)X_\ell(t)] + H_a(y; t) E[Y_a(t)X_\ell(t)] \\
&+ H_\ell(x; t) E[X_a(t)X_\ell(t)] + H_\ell(y; t) E[X_a(t)Y_\ell(t)] \\
&+ \sum_k H_{ak}(x; t) E[X_k(t)X_\ell(t)] + \sum_k H_{ak}(y; t) E[X_\ell(t)Y_k(t)] \\
&+ \sum_k H_{\ell k}(x; t) E[X_a(t)X_k(t)] + \sum_k H_{\ell k}(y; t) E[X_a(t)Y_k(t)].
\end{aligned} \tag{A.28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[Y_\ell^2(t)] = \frac{h(m_\ell(t), v_\ell(t))}{\sum_j h(m_j(t), v_j(t))} b_2(\ell) \\
&+ 2b_1(\ell) [H_\ell(x; t) E[X_\ell(t)Y_\ell(t)] + H_\ell(y; t) E[Y_\ell^2(t)]] \\
&+ 2b_1(\ell) \sum_j H_{\ell j}(x; t) E[X_j(t)Y_\ell(t)] + H_{\ell j}(y; t) E[Y_\ell(t)Y_j(t)]
\end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

For  $j \neq k$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[Y_k(t)Y_j(t)] \\
&= \left\{ H_j(x;t)E[X_j(t)Y_k(t)] + H_j(y;t)E[Y_j(t)Y_k(t)] \right\} b_1(j) \\
&+ \left\{ H_k(x;t)E[X_k(t)Y_j(t)] + H_k(y;t)E[Y_j(t)Y_k(t)] \right\} b_1(k) \\
&+ b_1(j) \sum_{\ell} H_{j\ell}(x;t)E[X_{\ell}(t)Y_k(t)] + H_{j\ell}(y;t)E[Y_k(t)Y_{\ell}(t)] \\
&+ b_1(k) \sum_{\ell} H_{k\ell}(x;t)E[X_{\ell}(t)Y_j(t)] + H_{k\ell}(y;t)E[Y_{\ell}(t)Y_j(t)]
\end{aligned} \tag{A.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[X_k(t)Y_k(t)] \\
&= \frac{h_k(m_k(t), v_k(t))}{\sum_j h_j(m_j(t), v_j(t))} b_1(k) \\
&+ H_k(x;t) \left\{ E[Y_k(t)X_k(t)] + E[X_k^2(t)] b_1(k) \right\} \\
&+ H_k(y;t) \left\{ E[Y_k^2(t)] + E[X_k(t)Y_k(t)] b_1(k) \right\} \\
&+ \sum_j \left\{ H_{kj}(x;t)E[X_j(t)Y_k(t)] + H_{kj}(y;t)E[Y_k(t)Y_j(t)] \right\} \\
&+ \sum_j \left\{ H_{kj}(x;t)E[X_j(t)X_k(t)] + H_{kj}(y;t)E[X_k(t)Y_j(t)] \right\} b_1(k)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.31}$$

For  $\ell \neq k$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} E[X_\ell(t)Y_k(t)] \\
&= H_\ell(x;t)E[X_\ell(t)Y_k(t)] + H_\ell(y;t)E[Y_\ell(t)Y_k(t)] \\
&+ \{H_k(x;t)E[X_\ell(t)X_k(t)] + H_k(y;t)E[X_\ell(t)Y_k(t)]\}b_1(k) \\
&+ \sum_j H_{\ell j}(x;t)E[X_j(t)Y_k(t)] + H_{\ell j}(y;t)E[Y_k(t)Y_j(t)] \\
&+ \sum_j \{H_{kj}(x;t)E[X_j(t)X_\ell(t)] + H_{kj}(y;t)E[Y_j(t)X_\ell(t)]\}b_1(k)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.32}$$

## INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1.	Research Office (Code 08) .....	1
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
2.	Dudley Knox Library (Code 52) .....	2
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5002	
3.	Defense Technical Information Center .....	2
	Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	
4.	Director, Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8) .....	2
	8000 The Joint Staff Washington, DC 20310-8000	
5.	Deputy Director for Technical Operations, J-8 .....	1
	8000 The Joint Staff Washington, DC 20310-8000	
6.	Chief, Warfare Analysis Division, J-8 .....	1
	8000 The Joint Staff Washington, DC 20310-8000	
7.	Prof. Donald P. Gaver (Code OR/Gv) .....	10
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
8.	Prof. Patricia A. Jacobs (Code OR/Jc) .....	5
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
9.	Prof. Mark Youngren (Code OR/Ym) .....	5
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
10.	Prof. George Connor (Code OR/Co) .....	1
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
11.	Prof. Michael Sovereign (Code OR/Sm) .....	1
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
12.	Ms. Therese Bilodeau (Code OR/Bi) .....	1
	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	

13. Dr. J. Abrahams, Code 1111, Room 607 ..... 1  
Mathematical Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
14. Dr. John Bailar ..... 1  
468 N St. NW  
Washington, DC 20024
15. Prof. D. R. Barr ..... 1  
Dept. of Systems Engineering  
U.S. Military Academy  
West Point, NY 10996
16. Dr. David Brillinger ..... 1  
Statistics Department  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720
17. Dr. David Burman ..... 1  
AT&T Bell Telephone Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
18. Prof. Brad Carlin ..... 1  
School of Public Health  
University of Minnesota  
Mayo Bldg. A460  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
19. Dr. Robert Carpenter ..... 1  
NAMRI/Navy Toxicology Detachment  
Bldg. 433, Area B  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6503
20. Center for Naval Analyses ..... 1  
4401 Ford Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268
21. Prof. H. Chernoff ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
Harvard University  
1 Oxford Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
22. Mr. Wm. P. Clay ..... 1  
Director, USAMSAA  
Attn: AMXSU-CA  
APG, MD 21005-5071
23. Dr. Edward G. Coffman, Jr. .... 1  
AT&T Bell Telephone Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

24. Dr. John Copas ..... 1  
 Dept. of Mathematics,  
 University of Birmingham  
 P. O. Box 363  
 Birmingham B15 2TT  
 ENGLAND
  
25. Professor Sir David Cox ..... 1  
 Nuffield College  
 Oxford, OXI INF  
 ENGLAND
  
26. Professor H. G. Daellenbach ..... 1  
 Department of Operations Research  
 University of Canterbury  
 Christchurch, NEW ZEALAND
  
27. Dr. S. R. Dalal ..... 1  
 Bellcore  
 445 South Street  
 Morristown, NJ 07962-1910
  
28. Dr. D. F. Daley ..... 1  
 Statistic Dept. (I.A.S.)  
 Australian National University  
 Canberra, A.C.T. 2606  
 AUSTRALIA
  
29. Dr. B. Doshi ..... 1  
 AT&T Bell Laboratories  
 HO 3M-335  
 Holmdel, NJ 07733
  
30. Dr. Naihua Duan ..... 1  
 RAND Corporation  
 Santa Monica, CA 90406
  
31. Prof. Bradley Efron ..... 1  
 Statistics Dept.  
 Sequoia Hall  
 Stanford University  
 Stanford, CA 94305
  
32. Dr. Guy Fayolle ..... 1  
 I.N.R.I.A.  
 Dom de Voluceau-Rocquencourt  
 78150 Le Chesnay Cedex  
 FRANCE
  
33. Dr. Andrew Gelman ..... 1  
 Statistics Dept.  
 University of California  
 Berkeley, CA 94720

34. Dr. Neil Gerr ..... 1  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, VA 22217
35. Prof. Peter Glynn ..... 1  
Dept. of Operations Research  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94350
36. Prof. Bernard Harris ..... 1  
Dept. of Statistics  
University of Wisconsin  
610 Walnut Street  
Madison, WI 53706
37. Prof. J. Michael Harrison ..... 1  
Graduate School of Business  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-5015
38. Dr. P. Heidelberger ..... 1  
IBM Research Laboratory  
Yorktown Heights  
New York, NY 10598
39. Dr. D. C. Hoaglin ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
Harvard University  
1 Oxford Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
40. Prof. D. L. Iglehart ..... 1  
Dept. of Operations Research  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94350
41. Institute for Defense Analysis ..... 1  
1800 North Beauregard  
Alexandria, VA 22311
42. Prof. J. B. Kadane ..... 1  
Dept. of Statistics  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
43. Dr. F. P. Kelly ..... 1  
Statistics Laboratory  
16 Mill Lane  
Cambridge  
ENGLAND



44. Dr. Jon Kettenring ..... 1  
Bellcore  
445 South Street  
Morris Township, NJ 07962-1910
45. Koh Peng Kong ..... 1  
OA Branch, DSO  
Ministry of Defense  
Blk 29 Middlesex Road  
SINGAPORE 1024
46. Prof. Guy Latouche ..... 1  
University Libre Bruxelles  
C.P. 212, Blvd. De Triomphe  
B-1050 Bruxelles  
BELGIUM
47. Dr. A. J. Lawrance ..... 1  
Dept. of Mathematics,  
University of Birmingham  
P. O. Box 363  
Birmingham B15 2TT  
ENGLAND
48. Prof. M. Leadbetter ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
49. Prof. J. Lehoczky ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
50. Dr. James R. Maar ..... 1  
National Security Agency  
9608 Basket Ring  
Columbia, MD 21045-0689
51. Dr. Colin Mallows ..... 1  
AT&T Bell Telephone Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
52. Prof. R. Douglas Martin ..... 1  
Department of Statistics, GN-22  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195
53. Prof. M. Mazumdar ..... 1  
Dept. of Industrial Engineering  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15235

54.	Dr. James McKenna.....	1
	Bell Communications Research	
	445 South Street	
	Morristown, NJ 07960-1910	
55.	Prof. Paul Moose .....	1
	C3I Academic Group	
	Naval Postgraduate School	
	Monterey, CA 93943-5000	
56.	Prof. Carl N. Morris.....	1
	Statistics Department	
	Harvard University	
	1 Oxford St.	
	Cambridge, MA 02138	
57.	Dr. John A. Morrison .....	1
	AT&T Bell Telephone Laboratories	
	600 Mountain Avenue	
	Murray Hill, NJ 07974	
58.	Prof. F. W. Mosteller .....	1
	Department of Statistics	
	Harvard University	
	1 Oxford St.	
	Cambridge, MA 02138	
59.	Operations Research Center, Rm E40-164 .....	1
	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	
	Attn: R. C. Larson and J. F. Shapiro	
	Cambridge, MA 02139	
60.	Dr. T. J. Ott .....	1
	Bellcore,	
	445 South Street	
	Morristown, NJ 07962-1910	
	(MRE 2P388)	
61.	Dr. Jim Petty .....	1
	National Biological Survey	
	4200 New Haven Road	
	Columbia, MO 65201	
62.	Dr. V. Ramaswami .....	1
	MRE 2Q-358	
	Bell Communications Research, Inc.	
	445 South Street	
	Morristown, NJ 07960	
63.	Dr. Martin Reiman .....	1
	Rm #2C-117	
	AT&T Bell labs	
	600 Mountain Ave.	
	Murray Hill, NJ 07974-2040	

64. Prof. Maria Rieders ..... 1  
Dept. of Industrial Eng.  
Northwestern Univ.  
Evanston, IL 60208
65. Dr. Rhonda Righter ..... 1  
Dept. of Decision & Info. Sciences  
Santa Clara University  
Santa Clara, CA 95118
66. Dr. John E. Rolph ..... 1  
RAND Corporation  
1700 Main St.  
Santa Monica, CA 90406
67. Prof. Frank Samaniego ..... 1  
Statistics Department  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616
68. Prof. W. R. Schucany ..... 1  
Dept. of Statistics  
Southern Methodist University  
Dallas, TX 75222
69. Prof. G. A. F. Seber ..... 1  
Dept. of Statistics  
Univ. of Auckland  
Private Bag 92019  
Auckland, NEW ZEALAND
70. Prof. G. Shantikumar ..... 1  
The Management Science Group  
School of Business Administration  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720
71. Prof. D. C. Siegmund ..... 1  
Dept. of Statistics  
Sequoia Hall  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
72. Prof. N. D. Singpurwalla ..... 1  
George Washington University  
Washington, DC 20052
73. Prof. H. Solomon ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
Sequoia Hall  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

74. Dr. Andrew Solow ..... 1  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute  
Woods Hole, MA 02543
75. Prof. W. Stuetzle ..... 1  
Department of Statistics  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195
76. Prof. J. R. Thompson ..... 1  
Dept. of Mathematical Science  
Rice University  
Houston, TX 77001
77. Prof. Steven K. Thompson ..... 1  
Statistics Dept.  
Pennsylvania State Univ.  
326 Classroom Bldg.  
University Park, PA 16802-2111
78. Prof. J. W. Tukey ..... 1  
Statistics Dept., Fine Hall  
Princeton University  
Princeton, NJ 08540
79. Dr. D. Vere-Jones ..... 1  
Dept. of Math, Victoria Univ. of Wellington  
P. O. Box 196  
Wellington  
NEW ZEALAND
80. Prof. David L. Wallace ..... 1  
Statistics Dept., University of Chicago  
5734 S. University Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60637
81. Dr. Ed Wegman ..... 1  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA 22030
82. Dr. Alan Weiss ..... 1  
Rm. 2C-118  
AT&T Bell Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-2040
83. Dr. P. Welch ..... 1  
IBM Research Laboratory  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
84. Prof. Roy Welsch ..... 1  
Sloan School  
M.I.T.  
Cambridge, MA 02139